IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

HARVEY NORMAN SALOUM,

No. 3:18-cv-00612-YY

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

CHIEF OF POLICE TERRANCE JOHN WRIGHT; WILLIAM BYRON PORTER DISTRICT ATTORNEY; PAUL BINFORD DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY; & CITY OF TILLAMOOK,

Defendant.

HERNÁNDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge You issued a Findings and Recommendation [24] on July 23, 2018, in which she recommends that this Court grant Defendants' Motion to Dismiss [18] and deny Defendants' Rule 11 Motion for Sanctions [18]. Judge You also recommends dismissing *sua sponte* the claims against Defendants Porter and Binford. The matter is now before the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

Plaintiff filed timely objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation. Pl. Obj., ECF 26. When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc).

The Court has carefully considered Plaintiff's objections and concludes there is no basis to modify the Findings & Recommendation. The Court has also reviewed the pertinent portions of the record *de novo* and finds no error in the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge You's Findings and Recommendation [24]. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED [18], and Defendants' Rule 11 Motion for Sanctions is DENIED [18]. The Court also dismisses the claims against Defendants Porter and Binford. Accordingly, this case is dismissed in its entirety with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this _____day of _______

United States District Judge